

Decision _____

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

JENNIFER AND RICHARD PELAEZ,

Complainants,

vs.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON
COMPANY,

Defendant.

(ECP)
Case 01-04-037
(Filed April 24, 2001)

Richard Pelaez, for complainants.
Patricia A. Aldridge, for defendant.

O P I N I O N

Complainant Richard Pelaez testified he paid his electric bill October 29, 1999 in the amount of \$181.20, for account number 2-190852095, utilizing a service called QuickCheck.¹ Southern California Edison Company (SCE) agrees the complainants requested that a check against their account be issued. However, SCE's witness testified the check was returned marked "Unable to

¹ To use the service, a customer calls SCE and requests QuickCheck to pay his utility bill. QuickCheck pays the bill and issues a check against the customer's bank account. If the bank does not honor the check, QuickCheck reverses the transaction.

Locate” and the \$181.20 was never applied to the account. Complainant testified the \$181.20 was deducted from his checking account. SCE made several requests for complainants to provide a copy of their bank statement to prove the amount was deducted from their checking account but complainants failed to provide these documents. Complainants believe SCE misplaced the funds and placed blame on the bank. Complainant testified he has a copy of the cashed check stating the funds were taken from their checking account and paid to SCE. SCE denies this copy proves the funds were deducted from the complainant’s checking account and paid to SCE.

The presiding administrative law judge continued the case for three months to allow complainants to provide their bank statement showing that funds were actually deducted from their account. Complainants failed to produce the bank statement. There is no proof of a payment of \$181.20 to SCE. The relief requested is denied.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The relief requested is denied. The \$181.20 on deposit with the Commission shall be disbursed to defendant.

2. Case 01-04-037 is closed.

This order is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.